Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	**Application No.**	**Applicant(s)**	
	10/550,002	IKEMIZU ET AL.	
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	DAVID CORMIER	1711	

All Participants: **Status of Application:** _____

  (1) _DAVID CORMIER_.   (3) _____.

  (2) _NAPHTALI MATLIS (Reg. No. 61,592)_.   (4) _____.

Date of Interview: _5 August 2010_   **Time:** _2 PM_

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☒ No
  If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
_N/A_

Claims discussed:
Claim 12

Prior art documents discussed:
_N/A_

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/D. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 1711

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

 Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The
Examiner proposed an amendment to cancel Claim 12. Applicant argued that method Claim 12 should be allowed
with the apparatus claims. In a subsequent phonecall, the Examiner propsed an amendment to Claim 12 to put the
claim in condition for allowance. The proposed amendment was to add the steps of "determining whether metal ions
are supplied to a laundry tub prior to a spin drying rotation" and "detecting an unbalance during spin drying rotation." In
a telephone call on August 12, 2010, Applicant indicated that more time is needed to determine whether the proposal
is acceptable and that the Examiner should mail out an action. .